

32  
3

*The Road to Reversal*

Address

*Delivered by*

CARLETON PUTNAM

*Before the*

Fifth Annual Attorney General's  
Conference for District Attorneys

STATE OF LOUISIANA

NEW ORLEANS

February 16, 1962

*Printed and Distributed as a Public Service*

*by the*

NATIONAL PUTNAM LETTERS COMMITTEE

11 8  
4 2 5  
7 1 1



Here Carleton Putnam, author of *Race and Reason*, answers certain attacks upon his book with his usual directness and clarity. Sales of *Race and Reason* have passed sixty thousand and are increasing daily. It is now perhaps the most controversial book in America, and is unquestionably the most dynamic analysis of the race problem yet written.

NATIONAL PUTNAM LETTERS COMMITTEE  
P. O. Box 3518, Grand Central Station  
New York 17, New York  
MARK H. GERMAN, *Director*

## *The Road to Reversal*

Address

Delivered by

CARLETON PUTNAM

Before the

Fifth Annual Attorney General's  
Conference for District Attorneys

STATE OF LOUISIANA

NEW ORLEANS

February 16, 1962

Chairman Gremillion, Governor Davis, members of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, Attorney General Patterson of Mississippi, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It goes without saying that I am greatly complimented by your invitation to speak here this evening. I am also greatly complimented by the action of your Board of Education in choosing *Race and Reason* for use in the schools of Louisiana.

By coincidence, within the last twenty-four hours, I have read two reviews of *Race and Reason*, one appearing in the magazine *New South* published by the Southern Regional Council in Atlanta, and another in the *Reed*, a publication from the campus of Tulane University here in New Orleans.

Both of these reviews were amusing and well written. The only way they might perhaps have been improved would have been to have had the reviewers read the book. In one case the writer is troubled by my failure to consider a certain important phase of the subject and he asks



himself whether my omission may not be purposeful, since I might have had difficulty in dealing with the issue involved. Yet if he had read a few pages further, he would have discovered that not only had I dealt with it at some length, but had, I believe, disposed of it decisively. In fact I find on consulting the index that it contains no less than five different references to the subject.

Undoubtedly you have learned, as I have, that it is hard to make someone who disagrees with you listen to what you have to say. But it is a new experience—at least to me—not to be listened to, and then to be accused of not speaking.

Performances of that nature are difficult to answer. However, may I take this occasion to assure your Board of Education that I shall be glad to reply to all reviews they believe merit a response if they will call these to my attention. They have shown a confidence in me which I shall do my best to deserve.

On two occasions in the South last autumn I spoke on a subject which I called "This Is the Problem". In those talks I stressed the extent to which politically motivated equalitarian propaganda had infiltrated the life sciences since New Deal days and had spread from there throughout our churches, our mass media of communication, and our schools and colleges. I pointed out that this propaganda had captured the minds of Northerners to a startling extent and had created a climate of public opinion on which the Supreme Court was counting when it handed down its desegregation decision in 1954. I emphasized my belief that to solve this problem we must first unmask the deception which has created that public opinion, and I suggested certain ways of doing it.

I mention those talks now because of their relation to what I want to say tonight. I am calling this speech "The Road to Reversal", and I propose to suggest to you as lawyers a few specific matters which I think may be helpful. But I can hold out little hope unless, while you are organizing your legal materials, you also go forward with a program of public enlightenment. We must have a two-pronged attack. Neither one is enough alone. On the one hand the climate of public opinion must be changed, on the other the change must be crystallized in specific legal action.

Both processes can and should be advanced together. A well prepared legal case can do a lot to educate the public mind. And I would guess that some well prepared and documented speeches by a few Southern governors and senators might filter through to the courts. Organization is required in both spheres, but it is particularly needed in the legal sphere. Your legal case must not go forward too much in advance of your public enlightenment, and most especially your legal case must not go forward on half-cocked evidence.

I wish to avoid getting into the question, on which you alone are competent to pass, as to where you should attack and where defend. A besieged castle (or a series of castles) with a good moat, well provisioned and with a determined garrison, could often outlast the enemy. There may be many such situations in the South today, particularly if you use the time to destroy the illusion on which the morale of the foe depends. All of us know that at bottom this is not a legal war. It is a political war.

On the other hand, individual cases may arise where you will have an opportunity to go up again to the Supreme Court and challenge your



trouble at its source. Such cases might be likened to individual soldiers trying to scale your walls, sometimes succeeding and being sealed off, but surely that's the best you can do with them, but surely the preferable strategy is to work for the day when the individual case at last presents a chance to reverse the 1954 decision. Procedural delays may work for a long time, and are certainly legitimate weapons. Yet the surest place to end the war is in the camp of the enemy.

When I speak of legal organization, therefore, I do not necessarily mean putting all your eggs in one basket, but rather making sure that channels of communication are kept open among the states so that when the right circumstances coincide, the best lawyers and the best witnesses coincide also. It may be that a South-wide committee for this purpose is desirable, or perhaps "clearing-house" is a better word.

Whatever it may be called, or whatever the procedures you follow, the only sphere in which I can possibly offer any suggestions lies in the area of new scientific evidence, or I should say evidence not yet presented to the courts. I think I could assure you now that if a serious attempt were planned to reverse the Brown decision then I could name you a score of scientists who would be willing to testify—men who would come from abroad as well as Americans. Not all these men could be brought in for a case here, or a case there. They would have to be satisfied of the seriousness of the effort.

And I would have to caution you that to let yourselves be dragged into a nose-counting competition as to which side had the more scientists would be futile. A friend of mine estimated the other day that if we could have a vote of all the scientists concerned with this subject there would be a hard inner core of pressure group

equalitarians who would make up 20% of the total. There would be a second group of courageous men, scientists willing to fight for the truth even at great cost to themselves, who would make up another 10%. And finally there would be the remaining 70% who would take the easy road, the road of conformity and political expediency.

In such a situation there is no point in going into a nose-counting contest, which of course has no validity in science anyway. You've got to examine brains instead of counting noses, and because of the clamor on both sides you must go even further. You must finally say both to the American people and to the courts: "Gentlemen, examine the evidence for yourselves." The most disastrous thing that the American people, or the courts, can do today is to let themselves be led on a leash by a bunch of left-wing scientists and their conforming associates, bragging as dictators always do about unanimous votes, when even a cursory inspection of the facts will convince any reasonable man where the truth lies.

If you can read the books of the equalitarians without bursting into laughter, I'll be surprised. The trouble is, the public doesn't read them; it takes their conclusions on faith—a badly misplaced faith.

Now let me offer you a brief summary of my own experience in dealing with these people. Those of you who have not yet worked in the field may be less discouraged, less misled, if you are alerted to the tactics and the strategy these scientists have developed.

The first technique you'll meet will be the quantity count we've just mentioned. There will be an attempt to overwhelm you with the vast agreement against you. You'll be told that no-



body—but nobody—believes any longer in innate racial limitations. Then you'll encounter what I might call the Herskovits gambit: You'll be assured that no one wants to be dogmatic about this but, really, the reason scientists don't discuss race seriously any longer is because they're bored with it—simply bored with it.

As a part of this phase of the matter you'll be given to understand that your position was perhaps excusable once, but now it's antediluvian. They'll tell you you're actually living back in the Jurassic Age. They'll say you've been buried down here in the South, and you're pitifully out of touch with reality. There will be scorn, there will be politely veiled contempt, there will be condescension, there will be ridicule, there will be assurances that all this has been settled long ago and that there's no point in wasting time reopening it.

One thing, however, you won't find in this brushing-aside phase—you won't find one word that deals with the substance of the issues. You won't find one scientific fact in support of the equalitarian position. I remember talking to an old and seasoned scientific veteran last summer and I was expressing surprise that *Race and Reason* had so far met with no attempt at refutation by scientists. There had been denunciation, but no approach whatever to real refutation, no advancing of scientific arguments or facts that a reasonably intelligent person could take seriously. And this old fellow gave me sort of a grim smile and then he said: "You haven't seen any because they haven't got any."

So don't be disturbed by the Big Bluff—that would be my first admonition. My guess is that there will shortly be a lot of unanimous ballots and they will be spread throughout the Northern press. My advice regarding them is briefly this:

Call the bluff. Say to these gentlemen: Could you for a few minutes stop counting your noses, endure your boredom and step back into the Jurassic Age just long enough to give us something of scientific substance to support your views?

Perhaps at this moment some of you in the audience are thinking: "Aren't you over-simplifying things a bit?" In one sense, yes, I am. There are other stages to this game which I'm coming to now. But I'm not over-simplifying the emptiness of the bluff. I don't want you to be discouraged by it and I don't want you to be alarmed by it. Do not let the virus of conformity which is rampant today throughout the country in every phase of life infect you and frighten you as leaders in the battle against integration.

Now let me suggest the second stage. The second stage I might call the stage of evasion. I could give dozens of examples from my own experience which, I'm sure, will be duplicated by yours. But I have time for only one episode which I'll take from the recent meeting of the American Anthropological Association in Philadelphia last November. There are some 600 Fellows of this Association, a majority of whom I understand are social and cultural, rather than physical, anthropologists—that is, they are more concerned with man as a product of his environment than as a product of his race or genes. One hundred and ninety-two of these 600 were present at the business meeting on November 17 and they voted unanimously in support of a resolution which reads in part as follows: "The American Anthropological Association repudiates statements now appearing in the United States that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites..."



Upon learning of this resolution I immediately called a press conference in which I publicly asked the retiring president of the Association (a Harvard man) a question which I transmitted to him privately in advance. This question was: Do you also intend to repudiate the following published statement by your recently deceased Harvard colleague Professor Clyde Kluckhohn, a Viking Medal winner and a long-time equalitarian, who said shortly before he died: "In the light of accumulating information as to significantly varying incidence of mapped genes among different peoples . . . it seems very likely indeed that populations differ quantitatively in their potentialities for particular kinds of achievement."

I also publicly asked the retiring president whether he intended to repudiate the published findings of Professor C. J. Connolly, physical anthropologist at Catholic University whose studies of white and Negro brains disclosed a higher frequency of increased sulcification of the frontal lobes in whites than in Negroes.

And I asked the retiring president whether he intended to repudiate the published statement of Dr. Garrett Hardin, Professor of Biology at the University of California at Santa Barbara, which reads as follows: "As a result of recent findings in the fields of physiological genetics and population genetics, particularly as regards blood groups, the applicability of the inequality axiom is rapidly becoming accepted."

I then called the attention of the retiring president to the fact that none of these scientists were Southerners and I reminded him that Professor Ruggles Gates, an Englishman who is probably the world's most experienced and distinguished physical anthropologist and human geneticist, had made the public statement that there were vast differences among races in mental ability and

capacity for development. I wanted to know whether the retiring president had any *substantive* comment on any of these statements.

At this point the retiring president had apparently had enough, because he referred my questions to the *new* president who was a professor at the University of California at Berkeley. This professor wrote me a letter which I would call a classic. He confined his comments to the quotation from Professor Kluckhohn and this is what the new president said:

"Relative to the statement by Dr. Kluckhohn, this in no way contradicts the position which was taken by the Fellows of the American Anthropological Association at the business meeting in Philadelphia. For example, people certainly differ in eye color. These differences are due to genetic causes. Very dark eyes are more efficient in the tropics, but this has nothing to do with the ability of people to participate in the democratic way of life."

To this I answered:

"My quotation from Kluckhohn was as follows: 'It seems very likely indeed that populations differ quantitatively in their *potentialities for particular kinds of achievement*.' [Emphasis mine.] You attempt to answer this quotation by citing differences in eye color and you make the obvious remark that these have nothing to do with the ability of people to participate in the democratic way of life. Kluckhohn spoke of differences in *potentialities for achievement* and these do have something to do with the democratic way of life. They particularly have something to do with the statement in your Philadelphia resolution which flatly equates white and Negro intelligence. Your answer is therefore completely beside the point. You



cannot deceive a child of ten with that sort of nonsense, so I wonder what your motives are."

Here the new president had apparently also had enough because I have heard nothing more from him since. I did have one further reverberation, and it came from the magazine *Science*. This magazine contained a news story which accused me of misquoting scientists, or at least quoting them out of context, so I telephoned the magazine and I asked what scientists they had in mind. They said "Kluckhohn", so I said, "In what respect?" and their answer was, "Races may differ in their genius for music but this doesn't mean they are inferior in their adaptability to our civilization as a whole. Kluckhohn may have been referring to differences of that sort." First we had the eyes, now we had the ears.

In this case I wrote a letter to *Science* for publication, and once more I said, "For my part I am willing to leave it to the judgment of any reasonable person whether or not references to 'man's innate capacity' and to 'potentialities for particular kinds of achievement' do not also in all probability include achievement involving intelligence, and whether or not differences in potentialities for intellectual achievement do not involve inequalities of intellect—in other words, superiority and inferiority in processes important to our Western civilization."

Perhaps you will agree that "evasion" is not too strong a word for the Kluckhohn example. As to the other scientists I quoted, mention of them has been avoided by the opposition, except for one remark in a conversation I had with the editor of the *Washington Post* who said some scientist had told him that in Connolly's studies of white and Negro brains the selection was too small,

to which I could only answer that if this scientist has a better series, let him produce it.

There's another kind of evasion illustrated by the Philadelphia meeting of the American Anthropological Association. The passage I read you from their resolution was only a part of the whole statement. I've mentioned it first because taken by itself it does present a clear issue. But it wasn't presented to the Fellows or to the public in that way. Here's the way it was confused:

"The American Anthropological Association repudiates statements now appearing in the United States that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites, and reaffirms the fact that there is no scientifically established evidence to justify the exclusion of any race from the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The basic principles of equality of opportunity and equality before the law are compatible with all that is known about human biology. All races possess the abilities needed to participate fully in the democratic way of life and in modern technological civilization."

Notice that the second clause leaves open the question, what rights *are* guaranteed by the Constitution? Before 1954 not even the Supreme Court thought there was any right to attend an integrated school, and the current view of the Supreme Court may change. Notice next that nobody disputes the general principle of equality of opportunity and equality before the law—the only dispute concerns the novel application of the principle in this particular case. Notice finally that everybody wants to vote in favor of the democratic way of life, but integrated schools have never before been considered, nor need they now be considered, an essential part of participating in our democratic society. I've already



learned of Fellows who felt they really were voting on these second, third and fourth clauses. If a resolution were deliberately written to seduce the minds of unwary voters, and to confuse the public in the impression it made, I can scarcely imagine a better one than this.

You practically have to take these equalitarians by the scruff of the neck and lead them up to the one issue and say, "Look—the issue here is *not* equality of opportunity. The issue here is *not* equality before the law. The issue here is *not* the democratic way of life. The issue here is that school integration is social integration, that social integration, always, everywhere, has and does lead to intermarriage in the long run and that intermarriage, under our population ratios in the South, will destroy our society. If you want to discuss this matter, discuss it, but don't confuse the minds of the courts and the American people by always changing the subject, by always evading this issue, by always slithering away to some broad and irrelevant generality."

While we're still on the topic of evasion, there is one more aspect of the subject to be considered. I've heard many leaders in politics and the press and elsewhere, when they've lost all the other arguments, fall back to their "view of history" or their "humanitarianism" or their "religion". Frankly, I've never been able to persuade any of them to tell me what their view of history is. I will admit that the editor of the *Washington Post* was kind enough to send me a copy of Alexis de Tocqueville's correspondence with Arthur de Gobineau which took place between 1852 and 1859. Since the editor also referred to this material editorially in the *Post* in an attack on the Cosmos Club, I assume he considers it of probative value.

But after a careful reading, I am able to find only the argument that an acceptance of the theory of racial inequality is wrong (1) because the theory will have bad effects in the world at large, and (2) because the theory itself is unchristian. Yet clearly we get nowhere in life by shrinking from the truth because we fear it. Such a policy is about as defeatist, about as decadent as any ever conceived. As Garrett Hardin has put it, "only those truths that are admitted to the conscious mind are available for use in making sense of the world."

And as to these constantly recurring references to Christianity, much as I admire Tocqueville I would like to ask the editor of the *Post* to name the man he believes would be the American whom the North, at least, would rank next to Christ himself in his broad humanity, his compassion, his sympathy for the oppressed—the American whose picture remote Siberian peasants tack to the walls of their cabins out of a sixth sense of his meaning in history.

Here was a man who far surpassed Tocqueville as a symbol of the Christian life, both in faith and action. His name was Abraham Lincoln and, by coincidence, just as Tocqueville was writing his views in France, Lincoln was making his Charleston, Illinois, speech: "I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races . . . there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."

Once again, I would like to make one thing crystal clear concerning the matter of kindness of heart and Christian principles as they apply to the integration controversy. I do not believe



in hurting others. My constant prayer is that I may never discourage anyone who is doing his best, never dampen anyone's enthusiasms or increase anyone's doubts. And I remind you that prior to 1954 the fact of racial differences was being handled with a minimum of talk about those differences. Even after 1954, the South, out of instinctive kindness to the Negro, went so far as to base its whole defense on other grounds.

And what was the result of that kindness? It was used against the South. It resulted in more and more encroachment. Standing here tonight, I place squarely upon the equalitarians the responsibility for raising the racial issue. It was their insistence and their brutality which forced upon all of us the stark necessity of stating the truth.

So you might just as well tell these people that the typical Southern white father and mother are not lacking in humanity and are not unchristian. This is not a question of humanity or Christianity unless self-defense is inhuman and unchristian. On the contrary, if there is anything which is anti-Christ and anti-human in this situation it is the ideology which forces genetic suicide upon a defenseless minority.

Of the many forms in which pseudo humanitarianism attempts to deceive us, the latest is the argument you hear more and more nowadays about the difference between an individual and his race. We're told that we must think only about the individual as an individual, never about his race—that a human being is a human being, and that ends the matter. Well, a human being may be either a man or a woman. We don't look at a person without considering his or her sex, and neither shall we ever look at a human being without considering his or her race. You

might remind these gentry that there are situations in which we segregate the sexes (there are even separate rest rooms in public places) and by coincidence in some cases the segregation is actually connected with control of the breeding process. I have already dealt with the major aspect of this problem on page 42 of *Race and Reason*.

As a man whose life has spanned all of this century, I would like to remark that I have watched with approval and sympathy the movement for social justice in this nation and throughout the world. I have seen nothing in it to contradict my understanding of American ideals until the momentum of the movement began to carry us beyond the point where injustice to everybody else became the price of further progress for the underdog. That's where the American ideal calls "Halt!" That's where socialism, Marxism, and finally communism begin. There is the hidden rock on which true democracy founders, freedom dies, and our country is taken from us by forces that have made a failure everywhere else and will make a failure here if we permit it.

If President Kennedy and ex-President Eisenhower jointly announce their alarm over the increasing restlessness among our people accompanied by the growth of "extremist" right-wing groups, let them look precisely here for the explanation. These groups may have been prodded into saying impulsive and angry things, but they are expressing something of basic importance. They are not frustrated by the strain of the Cold War, as the left-wingers would like us to believe. They are instinctively reacting against the moment when the left-wing pressure groups in control of both our political parties moved us past the pivot-point in our social justice crusade—moved us into the area where the good we were



trying to do for certain backward segments of our society was less than the wrong we were inflicting thereby on everyone else.

Most people, in the North at least, don't yet understand that the most glaring example of this wrong lies right here in the integration drive. You can make an argument, and you can confuse kindly people—up to a point—on the issue of taxing success to support failure. You can make an argument—up to a point—for social security and urban renewal and foreign aid and government favoritism to labor unions. But once you understand the facts, you can make no argument whatever for integration. Here at last, did our people only realize it, we've caught the socialist, the Marxist, the communist red-handed. This is the classic and unanswerable case—this destruction of the heritage of a thousand years to please the Congo.

So you can say with a clear conscience to every integrationist you meet: "You shall not pervert the word 'humanity' to cloak your effort to corrupt our civilization. You shall not masquerade under the banner of Christianity while you sap our strength at the roots and steal our birthright."

I may seem to be laboring the point, but it's very much a part of the total pattern I want to put before you. As you organize and begin your pilgrimage along the road to reversal, like Christian in Pilgrim's Progress you will encounter many challenges. In the scientific debate, which I am certain is of paramount importance, you will meet first Mr. Big Bluff and then the Serpent of Evasion. And as you drive the equalitarians back step by step, they'll slither from point to point until finally they seek refuge in the swamp of Sentimentality—where you'll meet Pseudo Humanitarianism and Bogus Religion.

It is here that I'd like to offer the third warning which experience has taught me. The outstanding characteristic of all the equalitarian scientists is their political motivation. The truth is that these men are teaching that races are biologically equal because they want them to be—not that they want them treated as equal because they've found that they are. An example of what I mean is provided by Prof. Melville Herskovits, whom I quote in *Race and Reason*: "Let us suppose it could be shown that the Negro is a man with a past and a reputable past; that in time the concept could be spread that the civilizations of Africa, like those of Europe, have contributed to American culture as we know it today; and that this idea might eventually be taken over into the canons of general thought. Would this not, as a practical measure, tend to undermine the assumptions that bolster racial prejudice?"

Now I'm sure no one can object to a scientist having a declared wish to prove something in his research as long as the public and the courts are aware that such is the case. But normally we think of a scientist as a man seeking objectively for truth, and I want to advise you that you won't find him on the equalitarian side of this controversy. The whole movement is blatantly and transparently a political movement, saturated with the ideologies of the far left, employing many of its worst tactics of persecution and suppression, and drawing much of its impetus from socialist and Marxist sources.

Remember, of course, that this fact alone will never win a court case or matter much to the well-meaning, uninformed liberal. I bring it to your attention solely as a factor in evaluating the validity of their scientific statements. Psychiatrists speak of wish-fulfilling dreams and here



you will find many wish-fulfilling pronouncements calling themselves science.

Mind you, too, that there is enough scientific terminology and enough superficial cleverness to be very deceptive to the layman. Not long ago, for instance, one of these gentry put his position to me in this way. He said: "The Inca and Maya had at one time a great civilization in the Western Hemisphere, yet this civilization never spread to other tribes of the same race such as the Apache and the Navajo. This proves that a race may have the capacity for civilization yet never disclose it until some unknown, propitious circumstance occurs, and therefore we may say that the capacity of the Negro at this moment may be simply awaiting such a circumstance."

To this, counsel for the South must be prepared to answer: "We do not claim and have never claimed that the spark of civilization has always taken flame in Caucasoid or Mongoloid tinder. There have been frequent cases where it has not, and the receptivity has varied not only between races but between substocks. The point is that in the case of the Negro it has *never* caught fire. We will even quote you your liberal Toynbee, 'The only one of the primary races which has not made a creative contribution to any one of our twenty-one civilizations is the black race.'" Toynbee then went on to offer some excuses and some hopes which have no bearing on this controversy for reasons that I have set out in *Race and Reason*. The quoted sentence is the complete and valid answer to the Inca and Maya case.

But I'm digressing. Let me return to this matter of political motivation. You will recall that it was the Franz Boas clique at Columbia that marked the beginning of equalitarian anthropology in America. Herskovits, whom I've already quoted, was a member of this clique. Another

member was Gene Weltfish. In the issue of *Newsweek* for November 27 you will find an item which mentions Gene Weltfish as co-author of a pamphlet called "The Races of Mankind" which *Newsweek* reports has sold a million copies under the auspices of the Public Affairs Committee. *Newsweek* places this sale, and the popularity of this equalitarian pamphlet, over against the position of Dr. George of the University of North Carolina in terms which make it clear that *Newsweek* is pretty strong for Gene Weltfish and not very strong for Dr. George.

What *Newsweek* doesn't tell the public is that Gene Weltfish once publicly announced that she had evidence to prove that the United States had used germ warfare in Korea. Nor does it mention the fact that she was listed by the *Daily Worker* as a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade and of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, both of which have been cited by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive.

To my mind, in evaluating the scientific detachment of a George versus a Weltfish, it would seem that the American people should be as aware of Weltfish's inclination of mind as they are of George being a Southerner. After this, if they wish to accept Weltfish's views at face value, that is their affair. And I would feel the same way about the courts.

Let me give you one other illustration. I'm not going to mention the gentleman's name because he hasn't made public pronouncements like Weltfish's Korean charge, and I have no desire to embarrass him personally. This man was for several years Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at a prominent eastern university. He has also been a visiting lecturer at Harvard. He has been an advisor on anthropology to one



of the big broadcasting companies, he himself has appeared on television and he has in general been an influence in what I might call the popularization of anthropology.

Now here is this man's record: In 1931 he was a lecturer before the New School for Social Research which was classified as Communist by a New York State Legislative Investigating Committee. In 1940 he signed an appeal for the release of a Brazilian Communist. In 1942 he was a lecturer before the School for Democracy which was classified as Communist by the New York Legislature and which merged to form the Jefferson School of Social Science, cited as Communist by the Attorney General in 1947 and by the California Senate in 1948. In 1942 he published a book in which he stated that "Soviet Russia is the outstanding example of perfect management of ethnic group relations".

Then in 1943 he was a sponsor of the Science Congress, conducted by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, cited as Communist by the Attorney General in 1947 and 1948. In 1946 he was a sponsor of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions which merged subsequently to form the Progressive Citizens of America, cited as Communist by the California Senate in 1947 and 1948. In 1947 he was a contributor to *Interne*, official organ of the Association of Internes and Medical Students, listed on page 20 of the Guide to Subversive Organizations. In 1950 he signed a letter to President Truman from the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, cited as Communist by the California Senate in 1947 and 1948 and by the Attorney General in 1948, and in 1950 he was a sponsor of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace, listed on page 50 of the Guide to Subversive Organizations.

This gentleman was foreign born and when he came to the United States he used an assumed name for many years, finally legally changing his own name to his assumed name which he now bears. I don't know why he changed his name. The one he had was perfectly good, the one he chose was perhaps a bit more pretentious. His reasons remain his secret.

Nor do I mean to imply that this man was or is a communist. I accept his disclaimer, filed with an investigating committee of Congress, to the effect he was misled. But I give it as my opinion that he was misled rather often and that his inclination of mind is far over on the left, far past the pivot-point in the sense I used that term earlier this evening—the point beyond which social justice ceases to be in balance. And again I think it is quite as important for the public and the courts to know the orientation of equalitarian propagandists such as he, as it is for them to be deluged with denigration of Dr. George because of Dr. George's Southern background.

I do not suggest that all professors of anthropology are in this gentleman's category. I think it improbable that you will find many situations like the case at Harvard where the FBI had to arrest a research associate in anthropology on a charge of perjury growing out of the Bureau's investigation of a Soviet spy ring. But it seems to me somewhat peculiar that Weltfish and this gentleman who changed his name should be placed especially in the public eye.

You have been patient with a long recital and I now hasten to conclude. After you have met Mr. Big Bluff and survived the Serpent of Evasion, after you have passed through the Slough of Pseudo Humanitarianism and Bogus Religion, after you have stripped the mask off the face of Political Motivation, you will come at long last



to the Gate of Reversal. You may not get through the first time, but believe me, your journey will set such tocsins sounding through hill and dale of this broad land that the true America, the sleeping giant, will awaken. He'll see you through in the end.

An acquaintance who has been very much on our side in this fight said to me recently, "We've become a nation of moral cowards, and that's worse than physical cowardice." I don't believe we're moral cowards, but let me emphasize that if ever there were a place where moral courage was called for, this fight is it. Let's be clear about it. You are not fighting just for the civilization of the South nor just for the protection of your children. This integration issue is the perfect ground for a greater battle. Here is the place not only to fight integration but to fight the ideology that spawned integration, the ideology of the far left, the overdrift beyond the pivot-point, the leeching that would bleed us more and more. This time the sleeping, bemused North must be roused by the South. As I said earlier, these hard core leftists, striking at you, have betrayed themselves at last. You'll never have a better chance to beat them than you have right here, to save your own society and to save the American way of life for us all.

I tell you this because I've seen enough of these leftists to know their kind. The hard core realize that in justice they have no case. The ones that came to America in destitution—even the ones whose ancestors came as slaves—know in their hearts how much better off they are than if they'd stayed behind, they know whose heritage they've been privileged to share, they know whose traditions and whose laws set the frame-work for this nation and what stocks set the tone of its character, so they know whose hand they're

fighting. And because they know, because they're guilty in their hearts, when you hit them with the truth they'll turn tail and run. I've seen them do it.

Recently Ashley Montagu, always a hard core leftist, a member of the Boas clique and for six years head of Anthropology at Rutgers, wrote a letter to *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* in which he accomplished an astonishing about-face with perfect composure. He said, "During more than thirty-five years of reading on the subject I have *not more than once or twice* encountered a writer who claimed the races were equal in mental ability." If you put that beside the 192 to 0 vote of the American Anthropological Association repudiating statements that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites, or if you put it against the trend and substance of the UNESCO resolutions which state that "scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual development", both of which Montagu himself signed—and, I believe, drafted—you'll have a picture of a man getting ready to run. And if you read the remainder of his letter to *Perspectives*, you'll see he's going to start talking now about there being *just a little bit* of difference. Not enough to matter.

Well, my friends, take the little bit and continue the pursuit. You'll find that the little bit has made all the difference between the Congo and the United States.

As for the rest of these people, the majority who for the moment are blindly following the hard core, dreamy-eyed and confused, how quickly they'll shift when they see the hard core turn! The conformist is really uncomfortable on his soul. Give him the leadership that rides



like Paul Revere through every Middlesex village  
and farm, and he'll come awake.

My time is up. If there were any exhortation  
that I could give you as leaders I would give it  
now. I would urge you to put aside appeasement  
and defeatism and local politics and economic  
fears. More depends on your steadfastness than  
you may realize. Never forget how crucial this  
battle really is. Our forefathers, down the years,  
whose faith and valor gave us all we've got,  
knew how to act in a crisis. They were not easily  
discouraged. They despised appeasement. So I'm  
not ashamed to leave with you some lines from  
a poet whom our English cousins loved when  
they manned the battlements:

For all we have and are,  
For all our children's fate,  
Stand up and take the war.  
The foe is at the gate!

\* \* \*

Though all we knew depart,  
The old Commandments stand:—  
"In courage keep your heart,  
In strength lift up your hand."